

LB 1059 where a designated amount of...a prior designated amount of a tax was to go to state aid to schools, together with the existing amount, but it was the intent that the growth, the normal growth in sales and income tax would continue to expand the appropriation for K-12 systems and through such a system is the only way that you could ensure that property taxes did not become the only variable that kept going up as the cost of K-12 education went up and that state aid stayed fixed at a dollar level amount. So the one purpose then is to provide that kind of stability in the long run, and based on history there is every reason to believe that the potential for history to repeat itself is very viable. Secondly, it seems to me that as an overall goal on this recognition that the cost of K-12 education may grow faster than the normal growth in sales and income tax, for state purpose, which again, historically has been like 5.4 percent. But if, over a period of time that the provisions of LB 320 and LB 1059 continued to grow in excess of growth in revenue, and it becomes necessary to either generate new revenue or increase tax rates, it will be very clear to the citizens why it was...what was responsible for that change. And I think in the long run that is probably beneficial, that if taxes are increased, we know that it's going for the K-12 system rather than for expansion otherwise to state government, or if taxes go up because of state responsibilities, that clarification ought to be clear as well. And then finally, what I've touched on, I think, in the long run is important, and that is that growth in available funds for appropriations would be consistent with the provisions of LB 320. Now, having said all that, there are some shortcomings you should give thought to, too. Certainly, when you designate funds, as this act does, those rates could be changed in future sessions of the Legislature, so it's not an absolute. It's only as good until the next Legislature meets. It does take two acts to make a change. Certainly, it's possible that it makes it more difficult to change priorities during the appropriation process. It can be viewed either as an advantage or a disadvantage, but it does at least...it doesn't limit future Legislature's in what they might do, but it certainly changes the process in that it would require two bills to be enacted to shift priorities rather than one, which is something you ought to give thought to. And finally, there's an issue that is included in here that some of you, I know, and perhaps all of you are being aware of, and it touches a little bit on the questions of Senator Hall, and that is that assuming the state reaches the 45 percent, which we're not at, but assuming we do and you have one segment of those items listed on